UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,175	02/20/2001	Shigeru Fujita	024304-00000	2341

7590   05/14/2004

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER
CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	H

DATE MAILED: 05/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 February 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☒ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2, 2/20/01</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-4 are presented for examination.

Drawings

2.   Figures 6 and 7 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only

that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or

corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

On page 3, line 11, "POS" needs to be spelled out before the use of an abbreviation can

be used.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 11, the use of the

term POS is not spelled out before the abbreviation is used. Appropriate correction is

required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moderi et

al (hereinafter Moderi) U.S Patent No. 5,590,288 in view of Lum, U.S Patent No. 6,272,529.

7.   As to claim 1, Moderi teaches a distributed processing system comprising a plurality

of clients, wherein at least one of said clients is operable in standalone fashion and has server

functionality so that it executes processing in response to requests issued by other clients and

outputs the results of the processing to said clients that issued such requests (abstract, Figure

1, column 3, line 47 to column 4, line 21 and column 13, lines 34-44).

Moderi does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

8.   Lum teaches that clients in a distributed processing system can be linked in series

(column 2, lines 53-58 and column 5, lines 31-36). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to connect Moderi's clients in

series so that the clients can be freely integrated and removed from the system without the

need for reconfiguring or rebooting the system.

9.   As to claim 3, Moderi teaches a plurality of clients, wherein at least one of said clients

is operable in standalone fashion and has server functionality so that it executes processing in

response to requests issued by other clients and outputs the results of the processing to said

clients that issued such requests (abstract, Figure 1, column 3, line 47 to column 4, line 21 and

column 13, lines 34-44).

        Moderi does not teach that the clients are linked in series.

10.   Lum teaches that clients can be linked in series (column 2, lines 53-58 and column 5,

lines 31-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to connect Moderi's clients in series so that the clients can be freely

integrated and removed from the system without the need for reconfiguring or rebooting the

system.

11.   Claims 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moderi

and Lum as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in further view of Moderi et al (hereinafter

Moderi[2]) U.S Patent No. 5,510,979.

12.   As to claim 2, Moderi does not specifically teach a distributed processing system

wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client having the server functionality

includes at least one of the following: product registration, product search, transaction

aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction, discount per target product,

designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history registration, and operator

authentication and registration.

13.   Moderi[2] teaches a distributed processing system wherein processing of a POS

application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the

following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax

aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method,

settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration

(column 13, lines 19-46 and column 15, line 19 to column 16, line 40). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include

Moderi[2]'s security and authentication functionality into Moderi's distributed processing

system so that employee identification information can be stored in a central location but

accessed from multiple terminals.

14.   As to claim 4, Moderi does not specifically teach clients wherein processing of a POS

application in a POS client having the server functionality includes at least one of the

following: product registration, product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax

aggregation per transaction, discount per target product, designation of payment method,

settlement, transaction history registration, and operator authentication and registration.

15.   Moderi[2] teaches clients wherein processing of a POS application in a POS client

having the server functionality includes at least one of the following: product registration,

product search, transaction aggregation per transaction, tax aggregation per transaction,

discount per target product, designation of payment method, settlement, transaction history

registration, and operator authentication and registration (column 13, lines 19-46 and column

15, line 19 to column 16, line 40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to include Moderi[2]'s security and authentication

functionality into Moderi's clients so that employee identification information can be stored

in a central client but accessed from multiple connected client.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (703)305-8864.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-

9197 (toll-free).

DC

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100